Case 3:03-cv-01561-MMC Document 501 Filed 10/24/05 Page 1 of 2 MANATT, PHELPS & PHILLIPS, LLP 1 RONALD S. KATZ (California Bar No. 085713) CHRISTOPHER L. WANGER (California Bar No. 164751) 2 EUGENE L. HAHM (California Bar No. 167596) 3 JEFFREY J. LOKEY (California Bar No. 200825) 1001 Page Mill Road, Building 2 4 Palo Alto, CA 94304-1006 Telephone: (650) 812-1300 5 Facsimile: (650) 213-0260 6 Attorneys for Defendants, DRAPER FISHER JURVETSON MANAGEMENT COMPANY V. 7 LLC. DRAPER FISHER JURVETSON MANAGEMENT CO. VI. LLC, TIMOTHY C. DRAPER, JOHN H. N. FISHER and STEPHEN 8 T. JURVETSON 9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 10 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 11 12 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION 13 14 I-ENTERPRISE COMPANY LLC, Case No. C03-1561 MMC (EDL) Plaintiff, (PROPOSED) ORDER GRANTING IN 15 PART AND DENYING IN PART I-16 ENTERPRISE COMPANY LLC'S VS. MOTION FOR ADMINISTRATIVE RELIEF PURSUANT TO CIVIL LOCAL DRAPER FISHER JURVETSON 17 **RULE 7-11 FOR PERMISSION TO FILE** MANAGEMENT COMPANY V, LLC, DRAPER FISHER JURVETSON ONE CONSOLIDATED BRIEF OF UP 18 MANAGEMENT CO. VI, LLC, TIMOTHY TO SIXTY-EIGHT PAGES IN C. DRAPER, JOHN H. N. FISHER and **OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS'** 19 MOTIONS FOR SUMMARY STEPHEN T. JURVETSON, **JUDGMENT** 20 Defendants. 21 JUDGE: Hon. Maxine M. Chesney COURTROOM: 7, 19th Floor 22 23

24

25

26

27

28

1

2

3

6

5

7

9

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

1718

19

20

2122

23

24

25

2627

28

20145235.1

ORDER

Presently before the Court is the motion of I-Enterprise Company LLC ("IEC") for administrative relief pursuant to Civil Local Rule 7-11 for permission to file one consolidated 68-page brief in opposition to Defendants' motions for summary judgment. Defendants, Timothy C. Draper, John H. N. Fisher and Stephen T. Jurvetson (collectively, the "Individual Defendants"), Draper Fisher Jurvetson Management Company V, LLC ("Fund V LLC") and Draper Fisher Jurvetson Management Co. VI, LLC ("Fund VI LLC")(collectively, the Individual Defendants, Fund V LLC and Fund VI LLC are referred to herein as the "Defendants"), do not oppose IEC's motion insofar as it seeks to allow IEC to file one consolidated 68-page brief in opposition to the Individual Defendants', Fund V LLC's and Fund VI LLC's respective motions for summary judgment. Defendants do oppose IEC's motion to the extent it seeks to limit the Individual Defendants', Fund V LLC's and Fund VI LLC's reply briefs in support of their motions for summary judgment to a total of 30 pages. Having considered IEC's moving papers, the opposition papers of Defendants, and the case record, the Court finds that the IEC's motion is HERBY GRANTED IN PART AND DENIED IN PART.

IEC's unopposed request to file one consolidated brief of no more than 68 pages in opposition to the Individual Defendants', Fund V LLC's and Fund VI LLC's motions for summary judgment is HEREBY GRANTED.

IEC's motion to reduce the number of pages available to the Individual Defendants, Fund V LLC and Fund VI LLC for their reply briefs from 15 each, as is provided by L.R. 7-4(b), to a total of 30 is HEREBY DENIED. Pursuant to FRCP Rule 56(b) and L.R. 7-4(b), the Individual Defendants, Fund V LLC and Fund VI LLC are each entitled to file reply briefs of up to 15 pages.

IT IS SO ORDERED

DATED: <u>October 24</u>, 2005

THE HON. MAXINE M. CHESNEY UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE